

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

FRIDAY, May 1, 1998

New York Times

May 1, 1998

Pg. 1

Senate Approves NATO Expansion; Efforts At Delay Defeated

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- The Senate voted overwhelmingly Thursday night to expand NATO, born in 1949 as a bulwark against communism in Europe, to include three of its former Warsaw Pact foes, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The vote was 80-19.

Adding three new countries to NATO requires the approval of all 16 existing NATO members. Once President Clinton formally ratifies the resolution, the United States would become the fifth country to support the measure, joining Canada, Germany, Denmark and Norway.

Enlarging NATO would redraw the boundaries of Europe, pushing the military alliance 400 miles eastward toward Russia. Perhaps most important for the United States, an expanded NATO commits U.S. military forces to the defense of Prague, Warsaw and Budapest, as if they were Washington, London or Paris.

Supporters said that expanding NATO will promote U.S. security interests by nurturing

new democracies in Europe, providing a hedge against a resurgent Russia, and bolstering the alliance's ranks by 200,000 troops, many trained in specialties like detecting poison gas on the battlefield.

"NATO enlargement will make Europe more stable and America more secure," said Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md. "It means future generations of Americans will not have to fight or die in Europe."

But critics contend that expanding the pact will dilute NATO's self-defense mission, antagonize Russia, jeopardize several Russian-U.S. arms-control negotiations and draw a new dividing line -- a new Iron Curtain -- across Europe.

"We'll be back on a hair-trigger," said Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., warning that enlargement would rekindle a new Cold War. "We're talking about nuclear war."

Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., who opposed NATO expansion, called Thursday night's action "treaty creep."

Expanding NATO has become one of the biggest for-

eign-policy issues before Congress in decades. It also hands a victory to President Clinton, whose administration has lobbied hard over the past year to win entry to the NATO club for the three new members.

The Senate's approval still leaves several questions unanswered. How many of the nine other nations seeking NATO membership will be invited to join, and when? How much will expanding NATO cost the United States?

The Pentagon estimates Washington's tab will be \$400 million over 10 years. But that counts only contributions toward NATO's "common fund," which pays for maintaining the alliance's headquarters in Belgium and other shared facilities and equipment.

The United States will also continue to subsidize billions of dollars of sophisticated military equipment sold to the fledgling NATO members so they can meet NATO's stringent Western military requirements.

On the Senate floor Thursday, senators dismissed, one by one, major amendments that

would have tacked conditions on to this and any future rounds of expansion.

A proposal to delay consideration of any new members beyond the three under review was rejected 59-41. Of the more than a dozen amendments offered by critics of expansion, the White House feared this one the most.

"What is the threat that would justify the expansion of NATO?" said Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D. "Let's pause and try to understand what all this will cost, what exactly is the threat."

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., who sponsored the measure, said that pressure to name new candidates will be "unrelenting" when the opportunity arises at NATO's 50th anniversary celebration summit meeting in Washington next spring.

"The bugles will sound, the march will be to bring in other other nations," said Warner. "This amendment would avoid the stampede."

But opponents said the measure would send the wrong

China Targets Nukes At U.S.

Washington Times...See Pg. 4

Pentagon Picks Boeing For Anti-Missile System

Baltimore Sun...See Pg. 5

Emergency Aid Wins Approval In The House

New York Times...See Pg. 5



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



message to Eastern European countries striving toward democracy.

"They would suppose, and not incorrectly, that the United States is slamming the door shut" on their chances for NATO membership," said Sen. William Roth, R-Del.

The Senate also defeated, by a vote of 80-20, an amendment by Sen. Larry Craig, R-Idaho, to require Clinton to allow Congress to formally approve the Bosnia mission before the United States formally ratifies the treaty expansion.

"We must not be drawn into a posture of indefinite garrison," said Sen. Robert Smith, R-N.H. "We're still in Bosnia, with no end in sight, no plan to get out."

But opponents said legislating the provision on the important treaty resolution was wrong. "This is not only confusing and harmful, it introduces a monkey wrench where we already have plenty of tools to exercise our will," said Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich.

Senators also rejected, 83-17, an amendment to require new NATO members to first join the European Union economic alliance. For countries struggling to develop market

economies, proponents said this was a more logical step than joining a military alliance.

"European Union membership would be a way to evaluate the economic stability of these three countries to meet their financial obligations to NATO," Warner said.

Opponents of the measure called it a diversionary tactic aimed at derailing NATO membership. "The EU has made it clear it will take years for members to meet their requirements," said Sen. Gordon Smith, R-Ore. "The amendment is a delaying tactic that runs counter to U.S. security interests."

When asked by a Hungarian television reporter if putting military integration before economic integration was like "putting the cart before the horse," Clinton said at a White House news conference Thursday:

"It's a very legitimate question," Clinton said. "For the United States and for other NATO members, we have to trust the elected representatives of the countries involved, in this case Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, to make the right decision on this."

NATO has expanded three

times before, adding Greece and Turkey in 1952, West Germany in 1955 and Spain in 1982. But NATO has never before reached into the ranks of its former Warsaw Pact rivals for new recruits.

Expanding NATO has been under discussion on Capitol Hill, in European capitals and at international conferences for years. But NATO took the first concrete steps last July at its summit in Madrid, when it formally invited Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to join.

Anticipating stiff opposition at the time, the administration took the unusual step of creating a special State Department office to sell the proposal.

The office, headed by Jeremy Rosner, reached out not only to obvious ethnic blocs, like Czech-Americans, but also to Jewish groups, labor unions and veterans' organizations.

Another important supporter of NATO expansion was the U.S. defense industry, which stood to reap huge profits from selling new sophisticated weaponry to NATO novices who must upgrade their armed forces to meet stringent Western military standards.

Over the past year, the Sen-

ate held a dozen hearings on NATO expansion and 17 meetings of the 28-member Senate observer group on NATO. Senate committees compiled more than 550 pages of testimony from witnesses, supportive and hostile to the proposal.

Yet a public perception persisted that the nation was making a momentous decision with no debate of the merits.

When the Senate formally began discussing the resolution last month, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, a NATO supporter, shoehorned it in between other bills. Many senators complained that landmark foreign policy was getting short shrift, and gave the impression the Senate was shirking its constitutional duty.

Only this week did a real debate break out on the Senate floor. Even then there were rarely more than a dozen senators on the floor at once.

"When an entity works as well as NATO has, the American people tend to either ignore it or take it for granted," said Sen. Charles Robb, D-Va. "Perhaps that explains the lack of widespread public interest in expanding NATO."

New York Times

May 1, 1998

Analysis

Clinton's Foreign Policy Crystallized

By James Bennet

WASHINGTON -- As president, Bill Clinton has often agonized over using force. But Thursday night he presided over one of the most dramatic expansions of the American military umbrella in 50 years, as the Senate voted to approve his plan to bring Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into the NATO alliance.

Despite the seeming paradox, Clinton's carefully plotted expansion of NATO crystal-

lizes his overall foreign policy goal.

Through a series of ever-tightening security, cultural and economic alliances, Clinton hopes to enmesh as many nations as possible in what he has called a "web of institutions and arrangements" that protects and guides those within "while isolating those who challenge them from the outside."

It is the country most pointedly left outside today -- Russia -- that defines the risks of the president's historic gamble in

Europe. Whether expanding the alliance into Central Europe makes Russia feel threatened in the coming decades will ultimately determine the wisdom of this move.

In remarks before the vote, Clinton framed it in epic terms, predicting that it would help realize "a dream of a generation, a Europe that is united, democratic and secure for the first time since the rise of nation states on the European continent."

Maybe. Maybe the naysayers who warn that expansion will alienate Russia and inflame its nationalists will be proved wrong. Maybe Clinton will successfully define a new

mission for NATO, as he has suggested, that goes beyond guarding against Russia to protecting against post-Cold War threats like terrorism, ethnic hatred and environmental degradation.

Certainly, by drawing three Central European nations into NATO, the United States guarantees itself enhanced influence in the region just as European nations are fusing into a formidable economic bloc that could become an American rival. This weekend the European Union formally begins preparations for a new single currency.

In the near term there can be

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

no doubt that the vote Thursday night was a political victory for a president who badly needed one, from a Congress in no mood to grant him one. The importance was underscored by the fact that the vote followed by hours the latest indictment of Webster Hubbell, Clinton's old friend and former appointee, this time on tax charges.

In the kind of coincidence that dogs this presidency, Clinton's latest great success over NATO, the summit meeting in Paris at which Russia acceded to the expansion, came as the Supreme Court permitted the Paula Jones sexual-misconduct lawsuit to proceed.

Clinton's aides were delighted with the vote, in part because they regard NATO expansion, as one put it, as pure Clinton, his from conception through development and now into implementation.

Unlike Washington's involvement in Bosnia or Somalia, NATO expansion was not a foreign policy headache that Clinton inherited from George Bush. It was a potential headache that he created for himself. But a combination of political calculation, good timing

and methodical lobbying produced the vote Thursday night.

Clinton first committed himself to expanding NATO in January 1994, when he declared in Prague, Czech Republic, that doing so was no longer a question of whether, but when. His NATO campaign had just received support from an unexpected quarter, the strong showing in the December 1993 Russian parliamentary elections of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, a far-right nationalist. Suddenly, Russia seemed like a potentially scary place again.

In 1995, Clinton received another boost from the decision to use NATO forces to quell ethnic violence in Bosnia. The mission demonstrated that the alliance could play a useful role in Europe, even with the Soviet Union dismantled.

The president began his final push for NATO expansion in the fall of 1996, when he declared that he wanted to add a first batch of new nations by 1999, the 50th birthday of the alliance. It was no accident that Clinton made his announcement in a campaign speech. The Democrats viewed expanding NATO as a prime entice-

ment to the critical swing voters that pollsters call "white ethnics," particularly Polish-American voters.

Republicans were interested in the same group. And more conservative Republicans were inclined toward bringing more nations into NATO for another reason. They viewed doing so as consolidating Ronald Reagan's gains in the Cold War. Indeed, House Republicans had called for NATO expansion as part of their 1994 Contract With America.

In the campaign, Bob Dole's only complaint about Clinton's NATO policy was that he was moving too slowly.

Still, Clinton had to walk a fine line in selling his NATO policy to the Senate over the last year. He had to reassure liberal Democrats that expansion would not anger Russia, without antagonizing conservatives who favored expansion precisely because they saw it as a bulwark against Russian backsliding. The president finessed that problem for Thursday night's vote, but he has not solved it.

Conservatives are quite likely to push for more nations to join, right up to the Russian

border, although further expansion is sure to provoke the Russians.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, born a Czech and for whom NATO expansion has profound personal meaning, has argued that embracing Central European nations will actually help integrate Russia into Europe.

"If we want Russia to complete its transformation into a modern European power, the last thing we should do is act as if Central Europe is still a Russian sphere of influence," Albright wrote on Wednesday in an opinion article in *The New York Times*.

But what then is this newly expanded NATO for? NATO's first secretary-general, Lord Ismay, famously said that the alliance had a threefold purpose, keeping "the Americans in, the Russians out and the Germans down."

Of that triad, NATO clearly continues to serve only the first goal. For a former Arkansas governor who came to appreciate the power of international trade from numerous missions abroad for his state, that may be enough.

Washington Post

May 1, 1998

Pg. 12

What the Expansion Means

SECURITY

■ By voting to expand NATO to include the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary, the Senate is endorsing the promise to treat an attack on any of those countries as an attack against the United States, in accordance with the principles governing all of NATO's 16 current members. Although new members must be prepared to host forces from other member states, the State Department does not anticipate that the expansion will require more U.S. forces in Europe.

COST

■ A NATO study cited by the State Department projects the enlargement to increase the organization's general budget by \$1.5 billion over 12 years—with \$400 million of that cost

borne by the United States. The general budget covers costs such as expanding air defense, conducting English-language training and updating computers.

Many functions, such as coordinating command and control, conducting joint exercises and modernizing a country's own forces, are not included in the NATO budget. Those factors could push the total annual cost to \$1 billion a year for the new members and \$200 million for the United States, according to a Rand Corp. estimate.

TIMETABLE

■ Each member state must ratify the invitation. Four—Canada, Denmark, Norway and Germany—have done so, and Iceland is currently deliberating. NATO has set an informal timetable that all countries ratify the expansion by the end of 1998 so that the three countries can formally join on April 4, 1999, the organization's 50th anniversary.

European Stars & Stripes May 1, 1998 Pg. 2

Czech Senate Ratifies Membership In NATO

PRAGUE, Czech Republic (AP) — The Czech Senate ratified the country's accession to NATO by a near-unanimous majority Thursday.

The issue passed the upper

chamber of the 81-seat Czech Parliament by a 64-3 vote.

The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland received invitations in July to join the alliance. Accession talks with the three ended in November, but their membership is pending approval of their parliaments, as well as the legislatures of the 16 NATO-member countries.

Washington Post

May 1, 1998 Pg. 28

Serb Police Keep Albanians From University

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia—Hundreds of Serb riot police turned back Albanian students trying to enter the main university, despite an agreement allowing their return after nearly 10 years. News of the killing of three Serbs by Albanian militants added to tensions.

The students were turned away despite last month's Serb-Albanian agreement allowing Albanians to return to university premises they have boycotted for nearly a decade to protest Serbian rule in Kosovo province.

China targets nukes at U.S.

CIA missile report contradicts Clinton

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A new CIA report says that 13 of China's 18 long-range strategic missiles have single nuclear warheads aimed at U.S. cities.

According to an intelligence document sent to top policy-makers in advance of Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright's current visit to Beijing, the 13 CSS-4 missiles aimed at the United States — with a range of more than 8,000 miles — indicate that China views the United States as its major strategic adversary.

That is contrary to the views of some senior Clinton administration officials, who are seeking to build a partnership with Beijing's rulers.

The remaining five CSS-4s, along with scores of other shorter-range nuclear missiles, are targeted on countries closer to China, including Russia, the officials said.

China has an array of strategic missiles that U.S. military and intelligence officials say are targeted on the United States or U.S. military forces deployed in Asia.

It could not be learned how the CIA found out about the missile targeting on U.S. cities, but details about the matter were contained in a top-secret report that was sent to senior U.S. policy-makers two weeks ago.

China also has some 25 CSS-3 missiles with ranges of more than 3,400 miles, and it is developing two new ICBMs: the 4,500-mile range DF-31 and an advanced ICBM that will be able to hit targets up to 7,000 miles away.

Other Chinese nuclear missiles include the 1,750-mile-range CSS-2 and the road-mobile CSS-5, which has a range of 1,100 miles.

The Clinton administration has tried twice unsuccessfully since

1996 to win Chinese approval of a mutual "de-targeting" agreement. A similar pact was established with Russia in 1994. Critics say it is largely symbolic because the missile guidance computers can be retargeted in minutes.

Instead of joining the "confidence-building" de-targeting measure, the Chinese government pressed the United States to adopt its policy of vowing not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in a conflict.

The CIA report also undercuts President Clinton's often-used phrase that there are no nuclear missiles targeted at the United States.

In boasting of his administration's security record, he said in one speech in October 1996: "There is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child tonight. Not one. Not one. Not a single one."

"I guess this blows away Clinton's famous speech," Rep. Curt Weldon, Pennsylvania Republican and senior member of the House National Security Committee, said in an interview yesterday.

"He can no longer say what we knew all along, and his credibility is undermined by his own intelligence agency."

Mr. Weldon said the president "has used the bully pulpit to lull the American people into complacency about strategic threats in a way that has not been seen for decades."

A Defense Intelligence Agency report stated in 1996 that China was improving its CSS-4s and other long-range missiles with upgraded guidance systems and increased accuracy, propulsion and warheads, including the use of multiple warheads.

Richard Fisher, a defense analyst with the Heritage Foundation, said it is not surprising that Chinese nuclear missiles are targeted at the United States.

"The Chinese have been targeting the United States for many years," Mr. Fisher said, noting that the People's Liberation Army and the communist leadership view the systems as "deterrence against the United States," he said.

The United States is believed to have some of its nuclear force targeted against Chinese missile silos.

Mr. Fisher said the newer Chinese medium- and short-range nuclear missiles also are a threat and

are believed to be "targeted on very important American and allied facilities in Asia."

"These constitute strategic systems for the PLA," he said. "And they are investing a great deal of effort in modernizing them."

China also is developing a new class of long-range cruise missiles and is working to make its shorter-range missiles more accurate, he said.

"As the administration is seeking to enter into wider and deeper cooperation in space and missiles with China, let's not forget that China has consistently refused to join regimes of civilized behavior in the strategic nuclear arena," Mr. Fisher said.

China is refusing to join the 29-nation Missile Technology Control Regime and also rebuffed U.S. proposals to de-target, he said.

James Hackett, a former U.S. government arms control official, said China's long-range missiles have the capability of reaching most of the United States "with the possible exception of Disney World" in Florida.

"They have produced great big nuclear warheads for those missiles," he said. "And the only feasible use is to destroy a big city. What they have built are city-busters that are targeted on major American cities."

Mrs. Albright told reporters in Beijing that the United States is reviewing whether to lift sanctions imposed on China for its 1989 military crackdown on protesters in Tiananmen Square.

But she also played down differences and emphasized building a "strategic partnership," the Associated Press reported.

A Chinese general suggested to a former Pentagon official two years ago that the United States would not intervene in Beijing's dispute with Taiwan because Washington cares more about Los Angeles than Taipei, Taiwan's capital.

The remark was interpreted by the former official as a threat to use a nuclear missile attack against California, and he reported it to the president's national security adviser in 1996.

Pentagon picks Boeing for anti-missile system

Lockheed Martin-led group is passed over

By GREG SCHNEIDER
SUN STAFF

WASHINGTON — The Pentagon chose Boeing Co. yesterday to begin assembling a national shield against ballistic missile attacks, shunning a team of companies led by Bethesda's Lockheed Martin Corp.

The three-year, \$1.6 billion contract gives Boeing the responsibility to marshal a wide range of companies and hardware so the military can decide in 2000 whether to put the National Missile Defense System into use.

If the Pentagon exercises several options to move forward, yesterday's contract could be worth up to \$5.2 billion.

Lockheed Martin had joined with Raytheon Co. and TRW Inc. to form the United Missile Defense Co. in pursuing the contract.

Those companies have almost all the nation's current contracts related to ballistic missile defense, while Boeing's role in the field has been limited.

But Lockheed Martin has had highly publicized problems with an Army ballistic missile defense program, leading some experts to speculate that the company's failure would hurt its chances for a national contract.

Air Force Lt. Gen. Lester

L. Lyles, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, said

yesterday that while Lockheed Martin's past performance was a consideration in making the award, other factors were more important — such as cost, technical details and management.

"It was a clear decision and Boeing clearly was the winner from a best-value [perspective]," Lyles said.

Boeing's program manager, John B. Peller, disputed the notion that his company was an underdog, noting that it has conducted research in the field for many years.

Peller also pointed out that Lockheed Martin's partners, TRW and Raytheon, will now become subcontractors to Boeing on the program.

"So the difference really came down ... between Lockheed Martin and Boeing," Peller said.

United Missile Defense Co. canceled a telephone news conference, and officials there could not be reached for comment. Executives of Lockheed Martin also could not be reached for comment last night.

Industry experts say that while the win is a coup for Boeing, Lockheed Martin is not seriously harmed by losing because it stands to be involved in some of the programs that make up the overall system.

"It's more of a psychological win than it is an economic win," said Paul Nisbet, a financial analyst with JSA Research Inc. "I think the likelihood is that ... it will never get into production anyway because it is too controversial."

The Pentagon has been trying

since President Ronald Reagan unveiled his "star wars" system in 1983 to come up with a way to combat ballistic missile attacks. About \$50 billion has gone into the overall effort since then, and no working system has been produced.

The military has decided to hand responsibility for assembling the complex system to a private company.

The Defense Department history of integrating such hardware into a single network "is not very shiny," Lyles conceded yesterday. He said he expects Boeing to do so much more efficiently.

The National Missile Defense System the Seattle-based company will be working on is much less ambitious than what Reagan originally envisioned. Instead of countering a huge onslaught of warheads, this system will be designed to knock out only a limited attack, such as an accidental missile launch by Russia or a terrorist launch by a rogue nation.

Even so, the National Missile Defense System will involve a complex network of satellite sensors, ground radars, and communications systems to alert and guide anti-missile missiles housed at a central location. Those missiles will have to be able to knock a hostile rocket from the sky.

While only a handful of test shots have succeeded in doing that over the years, both the military and Boeing say it can be done. The big question, all sides agree, is whether it can be done as soon as envisioned — possibly by 2003.

"That's probably the biggest risk, can we really do it that fast," Peller said. "We will shoot for it."

New York Times

May 1, 1998

Emergency Aid Wins Approval In The House

By Katharine Q. Seelye

WASHINGTON -- Congressional Republicans stared down the Clinton administration Thursday, passing a \$6 billion emergency spending bill and winning President Clinton's promise to sign it, even though

it failed to provide money he had sought to replenish the International Monetary Fund.

Clinton sent word to Congress that he would not veto the bill, as he had threatened. At the end of the day, Republicans had removed most of the extra-

neous items to which the administration had objected, including contentious provisions on student loans, food stamps, crop insurance and assault weapons, and they had dropped proposals to pay for the emergency spending by cutting

other administration initiatives.

Still, some congressional Democrats were unhappy about the bill's provision to pay for disaster relief with money set aside for low-income housing. And some railed against a last-minute provision inserted by Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R-Texas, that would give the oil industry a reprieve on \$66 mil-

lion in royalties owed the federal government.

The measure also provides for a six-lane highway through a sacred Indian burial ground in the Petroglyph National Monument in New Mexico.

But the House quickly passed the bill by a vote of 242 to 163. Senate action was pending.

The bill, hammered out in a conference between the House

and Senate over the last few days, provides \$2.6 billion for relief from various natural disasters, including ice storms in the Northeast, tornadoes in the Southwest and El Nino-driven floods elsewhere.

It also provides \$2.86 billion for military measures, including peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and various ballistic missile programs.

For military measures, including peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and various ballistic missile programs.

House conservatives had rebelled against giving money for the International Monetary Fund, saying the lending process should be conducted with less secrecy and less risk. But House leaders agreed Thursday to take up the monetary-fund

issue soon.

In other action Thursday, the House voted 214 to 206 to approve a Senate-passed measure that would provide vouchers worth \$3,200 to parents in the District of Columbia to send their children to any private or public school. The measure now goes to the president, who has said that he will veto the bill.

House panel votes separate-sex units

Bill applies to military recruit training

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A House subcommittee voted 12-2 yesterday to order the military to separate male and female recruits in small units, overriding most of the armed forces' wish to mix the sexes from the start of training.

The House National Security subcommittee on military personnel also expanded an existing law by requiring the president, as commander in chief, and the defense secretary to conduct themselves as their military subordinates are required to do.

The panel rebuffed an effort by two Democrats, Jane Harman of California and Patrick J. Kennedy of Rhode Island, to strike the presidential language. They said they had no objection to the intent, but accused subcommittee Chairman Steve Buyer, Indiana Republican, of trying to exploit President Clinton's sex scandals.

"They are allegations. I think he deserves the benefit of a doubt," Mr. Kennedy said. "He is the president of the United States."

Countered Rep. Ron Lewis, Kentucky Republican, "I think it is entirely appropriate. ... It's not about party politics. It's a real concern."

Mr. Kennedy said he is undecided whether to attempt to kill Mr.

Buyer's language when the full committee meets Wednesday to write the fiscal 1999 defense authorization bill.

One battle that will continue is over mixed-sex training. Proponents like Mrs. Harman promise to fight the segregation move at the full committee and on the House floor if necessary.

The legislation mirrors the unanimous recommendations of a Pentagon commission headed by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker, Kansas Republican. To correct undisciplined recruits, the panel urged Defense Secretary William S. Cohen to separate Army, Air Force and Navy trainees into small units, and to house them in distinct dormitories. The three services have told Mr. Cohen they like the status quo.

The Marine Corps trains male and female recruits separately.

The subcommittee defeated an amendment by Mrs. Harman and Rep. Kay Granger, Texas Republican, to strike the segregation clause.

"Every report out there with the exception of the Kassebaum report has validated the need to train as we fight," Mrs. Harman said in an interview. "I'm not ready to tell the services their recommendations are wrong."

Opponents argue the 4-year-old policy has failed, producing undis-

Washington Times
May 1, 1998 Pg. 11

ciplined troops who are more interested in the opposite sex than in training.

The legislation requires separate barracks, but gives the Pentagon until 2001 to provided the needed space.

The panel unanimously approved an amendment from Rep. Roscoe G. Bartlett, Maryland Republican, requiring same-sex drill instructors in the barracks after hours. Mr. Bartlett said some recruits were required to wear clothes while sleeping in case an instructor of the other sex did bed checks.

"This amendment will give [recruits] a certain modicum of privacy," he said.

Congress also has appointed its own commission on the thorny topic of sex-integrated training. Its report is due next year, but Mr. Buyer said the panel can submit an interim recommendation before Congress approves a final defense bill. "We still have an opportunity to massage and change," he said.

The proposal on the conduct of the president and the defense secretary would part of the federal code regulating the military. Officers and senior enlisted personnel already are covered. Mr. Buyer said troops he visits complain of a double standard. The military is moving to punish sexual harassers in the ranks, the congressman quoted the troops as saying, while the president is not held to the same standard.

White House officials said details of the itinerary had not been resolved. However, Clinton will participate in the anniversary celebration.

The airlift was carried out between June 1948 after the Soviets shut off access to western Berlin. It lasted through September 1949.

European Star & Stripes May 1, 1998 Pg. 3

Clinton To Visit Germany

WASHINGTON — President Clinton will head to Germany this month to participate in the observance of the 50th anniversary of the Berlin Airlift, White House officials said Wednesday.

Clinton will meet with Chancellor Helmut Kohl on May 13 and 14 in Berlin and Potsdam, Germany. The president will then travel with Kohl to Eisenach near Frankfurt on May 14.

Air Force Memo Puts Clinton's Base Closing Campaign In Nosedive

by George C. Wilson
Legi-Slate News Service

WASHINGTON (April 30) -- The Clinton administration's uphill fight with Congress to close excess military bases seemed to become mission impossible Thursday with the surfacing of an internal Air Force memo that cites "White House interest" in keeping open McClellan Air Force Base in vote-rich California.

A visibly angry Rep. James V. Hansen, R-Utah, revealed the April 26 memo from Acting Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters to Deputy Defense Secretary John J. Hamre during a National Security subcommittee meeting to vote on portions of the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization bill.

Hansen charged that the memo documents that the Clinton administration is looking for "another way to circumvent the law" on base closings in a "blatant" disregard of the bipartisanship "we worked overtime" to create.

"This memo brings the administration down to a new low of credibility," said Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif.

No Democrat came to the defense while the Republicans on the House National Security Military Personnel Subcommittee fired salvo after salvo at the administration.

Rep. Solomon P. Ortiz of Texas, the panel's senior Democrat, termed the memo "very disturbing" because it sets down "points on how to

beat the system. I think this is wrong."

The protests got hotter after the meeting when Hansen and a group of other riled-up Republicans from the National Security Committee held a news conference in the basement of the Capitol. They called for a Justice Department investigation to see if there had been criminal collusion to keep McClellan operating.

If it is proven that the administration colluded on McClellan, said Rep. James A. Gibbons of Nevada, "there should be an immediate resignation." He did not specify who this should be.

The administration conduct on McClellan shows "utter contempt" for Congress and makes any new pleas for base closings "dead on arrival," said Rep. Tillie Fowler of Florida.

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, a former Republican member of the House and Senate, has said the only way to free up new billions for buying weapons is to close excess bases. Without such savings, military leaders have said, something will have to give: people, hardware or readiness.

Under last year's balanced budget agreement, neither the administration nor Congress intends to raise the Pentagon budget much above its current level of \$250 billion a year plus inflation.

Hamre went to the House Thursday to meet with Hansen and other furious lawmakers in an attempt to smooth things

over. But by day's end, Hansen had written a letter, co-signed by several other lawmakers, to National Security Committee Chairman Floyd Spence, R-S.C., demanding a full investigation and hearings into the administration's activities regarding McClellan, which is located in Sacramento.

"We are all deeply concerned about shocking new evidence of the administration's continuing efforts to evade the BRAC [base realignment and closure] law and keep jobs in California," the letter said.

"This collusion between the White House, the deputy secretary of defense and the secretary of the Air Force -- who is the ultimate source selection authority for this competition -- to favor one contractor and one location is outrageous, unethical and potentially illegal," the letter added.

Clinton was already in deep trouble with many lawmakers because he managed during his 1996 re-election campaign to keep maintenance depots in business at McClellan and Kelly Air Force Base in the key battleground state of Texas after area politicians had taken heat from their voters for agreeing to close down the bases.

Last year, Congress added language to the defense authorization bill designed to make sure that government and private industry would enter into a fair competition for the work that was done at those bases. An option was to move the defense work out of those

bases and conduct it elsewhere, namely at Air Force depots in Utah, Georgia and Oklahoma.

Fowler charged that the Air Force memo reflects an attempt to circumvent the fair competition Congress mandated last year.

In the memo, copies of which were released by Hansen, Acting Air Force Secretary Peters opens by telling Deputy Defense Secretary Hamre that "John Podesta has asked that you mention the Sacramento depot competition to Vance Coffman [a Lockheed Martin Corp. executive] during your meeting(s) with him during the coming week. The points he would like you to make are to encourage Lockheed Martin (1) to bind to win the work and (2) to perform the work at Sacramento."

Podesta is the White House deputy chief of staff. Peters then wrote 10 paragraphs of what he termed "background." The seventh paragraph states: "Lockheed says that it is reserving final selection of the site where the KC-135 [aircraft maintenance] work will be done, but is looking at Sacramento and also at Greenville, S. C., where Lockheed has an aircraft repair facility... It is Sacramento's uncertainty that is being translated into White House interest."

Asked to comment on the House Republican charges and the memo, Pentagon spokesman Glenn Flood, who handles base-closing issues, said no response had yet been prepared by the Defense Department.

Baltimore Sun

May 1, 1998

Pg. 1

Clinton softens his tone on Iraq

Level of compliance with U.N. inspections encourages president

By MARK MATTHEWS
SUN NATIONAL STAFF

WASHINGTON — President Clinton adopted a new, more conciliatory tone toward Iraq yesterday, saying he was "encouraged" by Baghdad's cooperation with United Nations weapons inspectors and suggesting he may soon cut the U.S. force

buildup in the Persian Gulf.

The president held out the hope that by October, the United Nations would be able to scale back its inspections of Iraq's nuclear program and switch to more passive long-term monitoring.

"We are encouraged by the level of compliance so far with the U.N. inspections and by the evidence that has been [gleaned] on the nuclear side that more progress has been made," Clinton said at a news conference.

Clinton said he had not gotten any recommendation

from the Pentagon on pulling back U.S. forces, but "at some point in the future I would anticipate some reallocation of our resources." The United States has two aircraft carriers and 36,400 personnel in the area, roughly double what it had in October.

A senior official, acknowledging a shift in tone, said the White House had to acknowledge Iraqi cooperation in order to maintain support on the U.N. Security Council for the whole system of inspections bolstered by sanctions. Russia, China and France

have demanded that the council reward Iraqi cooperation and give Baghdad an incentive to disarm further.

On Monday, the United States won a diplomatic victory when the council resisted Iraqi lobbying and threats and agreed to maintain economic sanctions against Baghdad for another six months, until October.

At the same time, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, acknowledged for the first time that Iraq had made progress in allowing inspectors into presidential and other sensitive sites and in disclosing its past nuclear-weapons programs.

Richardson's remarks were comparatively grudging, and noted gaps in what Iraq had disclosed.

"We, the United States, acknowledge progress in the areas of access to presidential and sensitive sites. There appears to be some progress in the nuclear file; however, we believe that it is premature to totally close that file," Richardson said.

Ten days ago, State Department spokesman James Rubin criticized the Iraqis for having supplied "incomplete information

in a piecemeal fashion" to nuclear inspectors. On other weapons programs, he said, they "continue to lie and hide the truth." Rubin said the record "shows how far away they are from the time when the U.N. could declare them in compliance."

Clinton said yesterday that "we believe that if Baghdad will continue to work with us, that by October we [and] the U.N. may well be able to certify that they are actually in compliance on the nuclear side and they can go from the inspection to the monitoring phase."

Monitoring involves installation of sensitive devices and other techniques to detect if Iraq is trying to restart a nuclear program.

Officials say there are potentially serious gaps in the information Iraq provided to the International Atomic Energy Agency that have prevented its inspectors from offering a clean bill of health.

Iraq has failed to volunteer information on all the help it has received from abroad in developing its nuclear weapons program.

Also, Iraq has not disclosed to inspectors how it concealed the program in the past, leading to suspicion that it might still harbor

some clandestine weapons program.

U.N. officials have been saying for months that Iraq has yielded much more information on its nuclear-weapons program than on other aspects of its weaponry: poison gas, biological warfare agents and missiles.

The latter programs are the responsibility of a separate agency, the U.N. Special Commission. Commission Chairman Richard Butler has said that despite a display of Iraqi cooperation in recent months, Baghdad has not revealed any new information.

Butler reported Tuesday that his inspectors had uncovered new evidence of mustard gas. He also has said Iraq has what he suspects is a supply of fuel for long-range missiles, which it is barred from having.

In other comments on foreign policy matters, Clinton was much more upbeat about the Middle East peace process than any of his subordinates have been in recent weeks and voiced the hope of a deal between Israeli and Palestinian leaders next week that would get the negotiations back on track.

Washington Times

May 1, 1998

Pg. 15

Saddam's biological arsenal could kill tens of millions

By Martin Sieff
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Seven years after Iraq was forced to accept international inspections at the end of the Gulf war, President Saddam Hussein appears more confident than ever that his arsenal of chemical and biological weapons will keep him safe.

Armed with enough power to kill tens of millions of people, analysts say, it is just a matter of time until he provokes another crisis by trying to disrupt the work of U.N. weapons inspectors.

Even before the U.N. Security Council this week renewed its economic sanctions on Iraq for another six months, Saddam was issuing veiled warnings that he might retaliate against the countries that voted in favor.

Iraq's ruling Revolutionary Command Council and its Ba'ath party leadership warned April 16 that any countries that maintained the economic embargo "will carry the burden of the previous crises as well as the crises to come and for any harm inflicted on our people."

Laurie Mylroie, a biographer of the Iraqi leader, said, "Minimally, Saddam seems to be planning another challenge, akin to the two that have already occurred" in October 1997 and January 1998.

"Saddam has benefited for provoking each of the past two crises, while he has suffered no penalty. Why shouldn't he provoke a third?"

Saddam's confidence, experts said, comes from two sources: his increasingly accurate reading of U.S. and Western responses to his actions and his apparent belief that he can inflict devastating casualties on those who oppose him.

"The Clinton administration's biggest problem in dealing with Saddam has been that it makes threats to inflict serious damage upon him and then doesn't follow through on them," said Dov S. Zakheim of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, former deputy undersecretary of defense in the Reagan administration.

"Saddam's calculations are different from those of most of us," said Miss Mylroie, of the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Phila-

delphia. "He has a rare understanding of how to use force and violence in political affairs. Thus, he surprises. And he sees weakness in Washington."

Iraq has enough deadly biological agents to kill every human being on earth, according to a Feb. 4 report by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the British government.

Baghdad also has the capability to inflict devastating attacks of incurable anthrax and other diseases on U.S. military personnel in the Gulf region, according to U.S. military intelligence assessments.

On March 3, the Pentagon announced an accelerated anthrax vaccination program for U.S. military personnel serving in the Gulf.

At a press conference, Lt. Gen. Ronald Blancke, the Army surgeon general, said nothing could be done for the victims of an anthrax attack once they showed symptoms.

Officials of the U.N. Special Commission (Unscm), which is charged with finding and destroying Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, say Iraq bought

39 tons of growth medium, the basic compound needed for biological agents, before 1990. Each ton can yield 10 tons of biological agent.

Seventeen of these 39 tons — enough to kill 50 million to 60 million people — are still unaccounted for, Rolf Ekeus, then Unscm chief, told a meeting at the Carnegie Institute on Ethics and Social Responsibility in 1996.

Anthrax, a virus that causes hemorrhaging in the lungs and is almost invariably fatal to human and animal life, has never been used in war.

Some experts believe Iraq has the devastating option of unleashing deadly plague viruses covertly on the U.S. civilian population while retaining a plausible deniability that it had done so.

It is ironic that U.S. policy-makers face this dilemma only seven years after one of the most low-casualty and successful military campaigns in history, the 1991 Gulf war.

But a series of miscalculations by both the Bush and Clinton administrations allowed Saddam's regime to survive after the war.

"There is now pretty much of a consensus that we should have destroyed the Republican Guard [Saddam's elite units] in the Gulf war," said Mr. Zakheim.

Both the Bush and Clinton administrations also allowed Iraq to retain a major biological weapons potential and the infrastructure to rapidly expand it because they didn't realize how much was there in the first place, said Patrick Clawson of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

"In retrospect, it would appear that we badly underestimated the progress Iraq had made on these programs," Mr. Clawson said.

The full extent of the Iraqi program was revealed in August 1995 when Gen. Hussein Kamel al-Majid, Saddam's son-in-law, defected to Jordan with his family, bringing enormous quantities of

top-secret documents with him.

That information, later verified by Unscm investigators, shocked U.N. arms inspectors and U.S. government experts. They revealed that by the time of the Gulf war, the Iraqi biological and chemical weapons production programs were far more advanced than U.S. policy-makers had dreamed possible.

Gen. Kamel's papers, and revelations by other Iraqi defectors, also showed that the month-long U.S.-led air bombardment of Iraq at the beginning of the Gulf war had not destroyed a single SCUD missile, and that Iraq still had at least 45 of them.

Neither Bush nor Clinton policy-makers appear to have understood the ease with which biological weapons can be developed.

"Any country that can make pesticides can make weapons of mass destruction," said military analyst John Hillen of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Washington Times

May 1, 1998

Pg. 17

West backs away as ethnic war looms

Milosevic sanctions largely cosmetic

By Donald Forbes
REUTERS NEWS AGENCY

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia — New sanctions against Serbia look tough but are mainly cosmetic because preventing war in Kosovo has taken priority over the West's confrontation with Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, diplomats said.

Mr. Milosevic's brinkmanship has sent the West a message that if it does not play the game his way, it gets the war — and the unpredictable outcome — that it fears.

The Contact Group of six major powers froze Yugoslavia's foreign assets Wednesday and threatened to block foreign investment beginning May 9 if Mr. Milosevic made no progress over demands by Kosovo's ethnic Albanians for independence.

The assets freeze will have almost no impact. And it was coupled with the promise that six years of diplomatic and economic quarantine, first imposed to punish Bel-

grade for its role in the Bosnian conflict, will be lifted if Belgrade cooperates in securing Balkan peace.

In Pristina, the capital of Kosovo, Serbian riot police backed by water cannons and armored vehicles prevented ethnic Albanian students and faculty from entering university buildings yesterday.

The incident occurred amid news of the death of three Serbs in the province, including a policeman killed Wednesday by a mortar shell in a police station on the Pristina-Prizren road. Serbian police blamed Kosovo separatists, the Associated Press reported.

Yesterday, the bodies of two Serbs believed to have been kidnapped by Albanian militants a week ago were found on a road near the western village of Decani, Serbian officials said, according to the AP.

"We were planning to occupy the buildings today, but it appears from the police presence that we will not be allowed," said Dr. Ahmet Geca, vice rector of the University of Pristina, who was at the head of the ethnic Albanian crowd

of thousands.

The diplomats said the big powers — the United States, Russia, France, Germany, Italy and Britain — effectively gave themselves and Mr. Milosevic breathing space to end a confrontation over Kosovo that had become counterproductive.

The Yugoslav leader seemed to have outmaneuvered a U.S. drive to punish him for his treatment of the Albanian majority in Serbia's southern province while opening an escape hatch from the damaging sanctions left over from the Bosnian war, which ended in December 1995.

Mr. Milosevic's refusal to deal with ethnic Albanian political leaders and the rise of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) have pushed Kosovo to the brink of a war that may already be too late to avert.

The KLA has reaped popular support from the failure of ethnic Albanian politicians who pressed for independence by peaceful means in the belief that the West would force Mr. Milosevic to submit.

The United States and its allies intervened two months ago with the aim of preserving Balkan stability from the danger of fighting in Kosovo spilling across Yugoslavia's borders into neighboring Albania and Macedonia, which has a large ethnic Albanian population.

They could find themselves driven into an unwilling alliance with Mr. Milosevic in order to defeat the KLA and achieve that goal.

Word From Kosovo: This Isn't Bosnia, 'It's More Dangerous'

Jonathan S. Landay
Staff Writer Of The
Christian Science Monitor

PRISTINA, YUGOSLAVIA - As clashes escalate between government forces and ethnic Albanian rebels in Serbia's Kosovo Province, the United States and European powers are scrambling to avert what they say could be a replay of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

But Kosovo could produce a conflict far deadlier than the strife that claimed some 200,000 lives in neighboring Bosnia and added the term "ethnic cleansing" to the lexicon of modern warfare, experts say.

A conflict in Kosovo could spill across international borders and suck in archrivals Greece and Turkey, both NATO members, shattering the stability of Europe.

"Kosovo is not Bosnia in a whole bunch of ways," says Ivo Daalder, a former National Security Council staffer who worked on the Clinton administration's Bosnia policy. "It's more dangerous."

The crises do share two common elements. The first is that they are the result of nationalistic policies that Slobodan Milosevic has employed to maintain his grip on power - first as president of Serbia and now as president of the Yugoslav federation of Serbia and Montenegro. Secondly, although both crises were predictable, the international community failed to take timely action to halt them and then took largely ineffective steps as they quarreled among themselves.

On Wednesday, the Contact Group - the US, Italy, Britain, Russia, France, and Germany - agreed to freeze Yugoslav assets abroad in a bid to pressure Milosevic to rein in his security forces in Kosovo and negotiate a resolution. But the group did not immediately impose a ban on foreign investment, a reflection of deep differences on how to address the crisis.

Mr. Milosevic ignited the 1992-95 war in Bosnia by sponsoring Bosnian Serb con-

quests in a bid to create a "Greater Serbia." The plan, which eventually triggered a US-led military intervention, relied on the large Serb population in Bosnia to seize land, expel non-Serbs, and run a proxy Serb state.

The Bosnian Serbs were helped by having the same language, culture, history, and ethnic roots as Bosnia's Croats and Muslims, which gave the Serbs insights for plotting military and political strategies.

But Milosevic enjoys no such advantages in Kosovo. The emergence of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) is the product of almost 10 years of repressive rule by Milosevic. He has tried to boost his popularity among Serbs by appealing to their reverence for Kosovo, the seat of their empire in medieval times and Orthodox Christian Church.

But Kosovo's 2 million ethnic Albanians, most of whom are Muslim, outnumber Serbs 9 to 1. This effectively makes the Serb police and troops from other parts of Serbia an occupation force encircled by a hostile ethnic group.

This could mean a "more vicious, destructive conflict than Bosnia," warns Aleksandar Vasovic, a military expert at B-92, Serbia's main independent radio station. "I don't think anybody will care about collateral damage on either

side.

"France had more French in Algeria in the 1950s [during a guerrilla war by Algerians seeking independence] than Serbia has Serbs in Kosovo."

"Kosovo is going to be like Algeria or Vietnam," Mr. Vasovic says. "The Serbs are going to be isolated in military compounds or in cities and outposts. The KLA will control the rest."

The Serbs have the advantage of firepower, with the Yugoslav army and Serbian police armed with jet fighters, heavy artillery, and tanks. But some experts question the Serbs' morale.

Milosevic has neglected the army, much of whose hardware is in disrepair. The police, meanwhile, have been given modern arms, high pay, and privileges, including permission to enrich themselves through corruption.

Their KLA opponents are lightly armed. But the massacre of ethnic Albanian women and children in the Drenica region by Serb police in February and March has brought the rebels an outpouring of support and cash for weapons from Albanian communities in Europe and the US.

By contrast, Bosnia's Muslims had little outside aid for much of the war. They were poorly armed and unprepared to take on the Bosnian Serbs.

Experts say the KLA may also garner strength from Albanian society, based on extended families, which values obedience and discipline. Albanians live by a centuries-old tribal code known as Lexe Dukagjini, which has preserved the powerful institution of *bessa*, or personal honor.

"*Bessa* is the highest moral value," explains Sadri Fetiu, head of the Institute of Albanology at Pristina University in the provincial capital. "If you break your *bessa*, you should die from shame."

The tens of thousands of ethnic Albanians who marched in protests over the Drenica massacres gave their *bessa* to sacrifice their lives for independence. Reportedly, KLA recruits do the same.

The greatest difference between Kosovo and Bosnia, however, is the potential for the conflict to spill into neighboring states. The unrest in Kosovo has fueled enormous sympathy among kin in Albania and Macedonia and reawakened dreams of Albanian reunification. Should a conflict in Kosovo spill into Albania and Macedonia, many experts worry that Greece, an Orthodox Christian state and ally of Serbia, could come in on the Serb side. Turkey, a Muslim state with a large Albanian population, could enter on the side of the Albanians.

New York Times

May 1, 1998

U.S. Report Calls Iran No.1 Terror Sponsor, Despite New Leader

By Philip Shenon

WASHINGTON -- Iran remains "the most active state sponsor of terrorism" despite last year's election of a more moderate president, the State Department said Thursday.

In its annual report on international terrorism, the department noted that Iran's new president, Mohammad Khatami, and his deputies had adopted "more conciliatory" rhetoric and had publicly condemned some forms of terrorism. But the report said their

words have yet to be matched with deeds.

"There is no evidence that Iranian policy has changed, and Iran continues both to provide significant support to terrorist organizations and to assassinate dissidents abroad," the report said.

The report, required by Congress, said that the Tehran government was responsible for at least 13 assassinations last year, most of them in northern Iraq against members of Iran's main opposition groups.

The number of casualties from international terrorism dropped last year: 221 people died in terrorist acts in 1997, compared with 314 in 1996. The department identified 304 acts of international terrorism last year, 8 more than in 1996, which had been the lowest total since 1971.

More than a third of those terrorist acts took place in Colombia, and most of those were oil-pipeline bombings by terrorist groups that consider the pipelines to be symbols of foreign exploitation of Colombia.

The deadliest terrorist attack last year took place in Egypt in November, when 58 foreign tourists and 4 Egyptians were

killed in an attack by Muslim extremists on a Pharaonic temple near the city of Luxor.

The State Department has singled out seven state sponsors of terrorism: Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Syria.

The report found no evidence linking Cuba, Iraq, North Korea or Syria with terrorist acts last year. But all of them harbored terrorists.

With the election of Khatami in Iran last year, Clinton administration officials said they hoped that he would move quickly to sever Iran's ties with a variety of terrorist organizations, including the Lebanese Hezbollah and the

militant Palestinian group Hamas.

Khatami has denied that Iran is involved in terrorism and has vowed that if any evidence is developed to suggest a link between the government and terrorist acts, he would root it out.

But the State Department report found strong ties between Tehran and terrorist groups.

The official Iranian news agency reported Thursday that the spiritual leader of Hamas, Sheik Ahmed Yassin, was visiting Tehran, where he met with senior Iranian officials and thanked them for their "just stand toward the Palestinian issue." The State Department

report linked Hamas to three suicide bombings in Israel last year.

The report praised efforts by the Palestinian Authority under Yasser Arafat to curtail terrorist attacks on Israel.

The Palestinian Authority's "security apparatus pre-empted several anti-Israeli attacks over the year, including several planned suicide bombings, and detained hundreds of individuals for their alleged roles in terrorist operations," it said. "At the same time, more effort is needed by the PA to enhance its bilateral cooperation with Israel and its unilateral fight against terrorism."

Peace talks between Israel

and the Palestinian Authority have bogged down in part because of Israeli allegations that the Palestinians have not been aggressive enough against terrorist groups.

The Cuban Foreign Ministry angrily rejected Cuba's continued inclusion on the list. "I think that the surprising thing is that the United States itself is not on that list," a Foreign Ministry spokesman, Alejandro Gonzalez, told Reuters at a news briefing in Havana on Thursday. "It is one of the main promoters of terrorism, of state terrorism, of invasions, and of a series of actions throughout modern history against numerous Third World countries."

Panel Boosts Funding For Covert Operations

Washington Post

May 1, 1998

Pg. 12

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post
Staff Writer

The House intelligence committee has increased "marginally" the roughly \$27 billion President Clinton has proposed to spend next year on the nation's intelligence agencies, allocating additional funds to modernize interception of worldwide telecommunications and revitalize the CIA's clandestine spy service, according to a statement the panel released.

One of the beneficiaries of new spending would be the National Security Agency (NSA), which has relied chiefly on space-based satellites or ground-based antennas for its eavesdropping, one source said yesterday. Based at Fort Meade, Md., NSA now "needs new computers and new tools to get into the new data streams that are crisscrossing the world," this intelligence expert said. Some of the funds for new NSA equipment are to come from reductions in spending next fiscal year by the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO),

the multibillion-dollar organization that builds and manages the intelligence satellite program, sources said.

Clandestine human intelligence programs run by the CIA's Directorate of Operations (DO) were another priority identified by the House panel for more funding in its markup of the Intelligence Authorization Bill for the fiscal year starting Oct. 1. The agency's spy service, reduced after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, has been in public disrepute since the 1994 arrest of the spy Aldrich H. Ames.

CIA Director George J. Tenet and deputy director for operations Jack Downing have been pressing Congress for more funds to rebuild the directorate and reestablish agency posts in places such as Africa, where almost all the CIA stations were closed down over the past six years.

For much of the 1990s, another source said, reducing the DO was an easy way to save money because it was cheaper to have case officers back in Washington, a change that automatically sliced the num-

ber of operations and agents run overseas. "They gutted activities," this source said, "and put us in danger of being less than a global service."

In seeking more funds for CIA human intelligence, Tenet and Downing have noted that some supporters of terrorism operate in African countries such as Sudan. CIA officials have told Congress that by having case officers operating in certain African countries, there is a better chance to track terrorists and of Chinese and Russian activities there and in other countries.

The House panel, as part of its plan for "revitalizing" the Directorate of Operations, has recommended small increases in funding to hire additional personnel over coming years for operations that are long-range rather than short-term, sources said. With operations directed at targets such as terrorism and arms proliferation, one veteran CIA official said new personnel requirements call less for recent college graduates and more for older personnel with language qualifications and overseas experi-

ence who could be transferred into the agency.

Rep. Porter Goss (R-Fla.), chairman of the intelligence committee and a former CIA clandestine officer, said yesterday the panel saw "the need for concerted focus on signals intelligence, human intelligence, all-source analysis and our covert action capabilities."

Only marginal amounts of money were added for hiring new analysts, sources said.

The panel's ranking Democrat, Rep. Norman D. Dicks (Wash.), said the bill "marginally exceeds the president's budget request" and provides investment "in areas where technological advances or lack of emphasis have weakened our capabilities."

Tenet yesterday appeared in closed session before the Senate intelligence panel to discuss the agency's espionage and covert action programs. That committee, which is expected to mark up its version of the authorization bill next week, also has made additional funding for NSA one of its goals, according to sources.

Graduated Response

Look for President Clinton to announce his approval of a broad-based strategy for protecting the nation's critical infrastructures from cyber-attack during a speech later this month at the U.S. Naval Academy. According to Carla Sims of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection, Clinton will be in Annapolis May 22 to deliver the keynote address at the academy's graduation ceremonies and will unveil a presidential decision directive that spells out the White House's plan for guarding U.S. information networks. Initial drafts of the PDD began circulating a few months ago (*Defense Information and Electronics Report*, April 3, p1).

Washington Post

May 1, 1998

Pg. 14

Isolated Iraq

IN THE latest Security Council review, even Russia, France and China were compelled to acknowledge that Iraq is cheating on its disarmament obligations. These countries were plainly prepared to seize on any evidence of compliance in order to start stripping away the economic sanctions the United Nations imposed after Iraq swallowed Kuwait eight years ago. Iraq failed to supply such evidence. On the contrary, evidence of its noncompliance was provided not just by the U.N. inspectors whose good faith Saddam Hussein has (unconvincingly) challenged but also by an alternate inspection team sponsored by, among others, Russia, France and China.

Not that the Security Council front is seamless. By the word of the respected inspectorate of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Saddam Hussein has made some progress in doing away with nuclear weapons and materials. On this basis, those nations friendlier to Iraq sought to close the "nuclear file" and to move in this realm from "search and destroy" scrutiny to "passive monitor-

ing." The United States noted the progress but demanded more disclosures, and of biological and chemical preparations as well as nuclear. Insisting that first Iraq must cleanse all branches of its weaponry and honor all U.N. resolutions, Washington was able to head off a weakening of sanctions at this time.

Saddam Hussein presumably intends to win the lifting of the international embargo at little or no cost to his arms ambitions. To succeed he will have to do better than he did this week, when he stuck in a position that detached him, at least for a while, from international company. Could he really have expected to brazen his way through by belatedly opening up those eight "presidential sites" to inspectors with a new diplomatic escort and by proclaiming without proving that the whole of Iraq was now dirty-weapons-free?

His cabinet warned the Security Council to lift sanctions or face an undefined "new state of affairs." Friends of Iraq should tell him that policies aimed at alliance-splitting will serve Iraq much less well than respect for his obligations to the United Nations.

Christian Science Monitor

May 1, 1998

Dual Concerns In Iraq

The head of the UN Special Commission tracking disarmament in Iraq is right. The regime in Baghdad, itself, holds the keys to ending economic sanctions.

Richard Butler noted that his UNSCOM inspectors were still not getting the data they needed to verify progress toward eliminating chemical and biological weapons, in particular. He pointed out that the UN team two years ago came across artillery shells filled with active mustard gas, a chemical warfare agent. Saddam Hussein continues to claim that he destroyed all such weapons back in 1991.

Are there more? What about the even stickier issue of unaccounted-for supplies of material to fabricate biological warheads?

Mr. Butler, like his predecessor, has found it difficult, to put it mildly, to get clear answers from the Iraqi government. Physical evidence, documents, and personal testimony from those involved in the weapons are needed. Humanitarian concern about the burden on average Iraqis must be part of the policy calculus.

Thus the UN Security Council was right this week to retain the sanctions that so tightly restrict Iraq's economy. Sanctions, in this case, are the best available means of pressuring an aggressor regime to relinquish weapons of mass destruction. Such relinquishment was agreed to at the end of the Gulf War, and it shouldn't be hedged.

That said, there has to be honest acknowledgement of positive

steps taken by Iraq. The country's nuclear weapons program has been largely dismantled. And, thanks to diligent diplomacy by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, Saddam has agreed to open so-called "presidential sites" to arms inspectors (though controversy swirls around repeat inspection visits to the sites). These steps are not sufficient, as yet, to warrant a significant easing of sanctions. But the time for that could come - sooner rather than later, we hope. The US should beware giving the impression that it may never OK such an easing.

Humanitarian concern about the burden borne by average Iraqis must be part of the policy calculus. This doesn't require an immediate lifting of sanctions, as Baghdad's spokesmen argue. But it does require a determined effort to see that the current program of limited Iraqi oil sales to buy food and other humanitarian supplies is, in fact, relieving suffering. This means closer cooperation with, and from, Iraqi officials - not always forthcoming. (It shouldn't be forgotten that Saddam has an interest in making it appear that such aid is not working.)

It also means increased support for private efforts to send emergency supplies to Iraq, such as the shipments organized by the US agency, AmeriCares. Washington should encourage such efforts.

The US and the UN have to show that a policy of dual humanitarian concerns can work: a clear concern to deprive an outlaw government of weapons that endanger its region and the world, and a concern that sanctions against that government don't devastate innocent civilians.

New York Times

May 1, 1998

Provocative Arms Sales By Russia

No longer sustained by captive markets and client states, Russian arms designers and manufacturers are selling their wares to anyone willing to pay. Recent days have brought word that Russian enterprises are helping Iran, India and the Greek Cypriot Government develop or buy new missiles. In each case, the missiles could alter the balance of military power in a highly volatile region where armed conflict between neighbors has occurred in the past and could again.

The Russian Government, while assuring Washington of its concern, has not done enough to curb these deals. Customs agents in Azerbaijan recently intercepted a shipment of Russian stainless steel to Iran that could be used to make missiles. Moscow's assistance to India to develop a sea-launched missile has gone on for at least three years, American intelligence agencies say, despite Russian denials. The Russian role may violate the Missile Technology Control Regime, an accord limiting the spread of missiles. Russian officials openly acknowledge the planned sale of sophis-

ticated anti-aircraft missiles to Greek Cypriots.

The motive for these transactions is primarily financial. The Russian arms industry, long supported by lavish state subsidies and sales to Soviet-bloc nations, has foundered since the Soviet Union collapsed. Weapons designers and builders must now deal with competitive markets abroad. They have found a profitable niche by selling expertise, materials and weapons that seem to fall outside the reach of international agreements designed to limit just such trade. Because many of the Russian enterprises retain close ties to the Kremlin, the Government is reluctant to curb their activities. The sales also increase Russian political influence in regions like the Middle East and South Asia.

Washington's complaints are muffled by America's own robust arms business overseas, often conducted with the enthusiastic support of the Clinton Administration. While these sales conform with international restrictions, they hardly represent a model of restraint. President Clinton, for instance, recently lifted limitations on the sale of advanced American warplanes in Latin America, a step likely to encourage a costly arms race among countries that

ought to be addressing poverty and poor health.

When political leaders let arms dealers set foreign policy, the result is usually destructive. Exacerbating tensions between India and Pakistan, arming Iran or giving Greek Cypriots a military advantage over their Turkish counterparts can only lead to trouble. More than likely, it will be trouble that harms Russian as well as American interests.

JAKARTA, Indonesia — Student protesters hurled rocks at riot police who tried to block them from marching off their campus into the streets of the Indonesian capital. Three officers and three students were injured.

Richmond Times
Dispatch
May 1, 1998
Pg. 4

Washington Times

May 1, 1998

Pg. 18

CORD MEYER

NATO's behavior benefits

Jane Perlez of the New York Times has been the first to question what effect the lure of NATO membership has had on the way the proposed new members behave. She has found firm evidence that the promise of NATO membership to countries who have lived under communism for half a century has had considerable effect on Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

While all three have a way to go before meeting Western standards of democratic rule and stable market economies, the promise of inclusion in NATO has clearly helped the cause of moderate government during a rough period of economic transition. But it does seem that as Hungary and Poland become more confident of their NATO membership, they have increased their outreach to their neighbors: Hungary to Romania, and Poland to Lithuania and Ukraine.

A decade ago, when the Soviet

hold on Eastern Europe began to weaken, NATO used to worry that old national resentments would surface again in the form of border disputes and mistreatment of minorities. This was a particularly sensitive issue in Poland, where since the defeat of Mr. Walesa in 1995 elections, the adoption of a new constitution calling for subordination of the general staff to the defense minister has reduced the strong political influence of Polish military brass. The decision last year by Polish President Kwazniewski to fire Gen. Taddusz Wilecki further reduced the influence of the Polish military.

Now it seems reasonable to hope Poland will become a booming economy. It could easily have fallen under the influence of nationalist and populist politicians. In effect, the pressure of NATO has succeeded in defusing and destabilizing extremist political forces from both the left and right.

Marek Matremherschek, the Warsaw director of CEZ government relations, has warned that Poland, without the prospect of membership in NATO, might easily have fallen under the sway of nationalist and populist politicians. The promise of NATO has undermined the effect of extremist organizations and rhetoric upon the Polish population and government.

In another example of changing attitudes, the Hungarian government passed over Soviet-trained generals for the post of chief of the general staff and reached down for

Lt. Gen. Ferenc Vogh, an English-speaking graduate of the United States Army War College. It is encouraging to note that seven of the top 10 generals in Hungary are Western-trained.

In Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, progress toward the rule of law and the protection of minority rights continues slowly. The judicial systems are still weak, and there is widespread financial corruption. But the promise of NATO inclusion, and its accompanying security, has overcome extremist support for both the right and left political movements. Now growing economically at 6 percent a year, Poland with its 40 million people, will become a midsize Western European power within the next decade.

As the first director of Radio Free Europe's broadcasting to Poland, Jan Nowak has continued to play a key role in his country's development. The Polish people owe him a great deal, and he has kept alive the hope and possibility of freedom in Poland.

The promise of inclusion in NATO, and the means to make known this promise via broadcasting and other avenues, has made the hope of freedom a reality in the lives of the citizens of these countries.

Cord Meyer is a columnist specializing in international affairs and a contributing writer for The Washington Times.

Chicago Tribune

April 30, 1998

Known Questions, Unknown Answers

Should the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery be opened to try to identify the unknown soldier from the Vietnam War?

Of course it should, and as promptly as possible. The Pentagon panel that recommended opening the tomb recommended wisely, and Secretary of Defense William Cohen ought to heed its counsel.

To be sure, the tomb is sacred, probably the most sacred military monument in the nation. But sacred also is the principle that every service member who falls in defense of this country ought to be identified if he can be and his remains returned to his family. Technology now offers the possibility of identifying the unknown from the Vietnam War, and that possibility imposes an obligation.

It appears, on the basis of findings by a group of senior Pentagon officials, that the remains of the Vietnam unknown belong to either Army Capt. Rodney L. Strobbridge or First Lt. Michael J.

Blassie, one a helicopter pilot and the other an attack jet pilot, but both shot down on the same date--May 11, 1972--in South Vietnam.

Strobbridge's mother is uncertain about opening the tomb. "My son is--I couldn't hug him or anything," she plaintively told The New York Times.

Blassie's family, however, wants to know. "All we ever wanted was an answer: Is that Michael Blassie or not?" said his sister Pat, expressing the sentiment that most people would identify with.

For Sen. Robert C. Smith, a New Hampshire Republican who has campaigned to have the tomb opened and the remains of the Vietnam unknown tested, the issue is simple: "If the Tomb of the Unknowns is going to remain sacred, the remains should be unknown."

He's absolutely right. But there is a larger point to be made

here as well.

Technologically, we are nearing the point—if we have not already reached it—where it ought to be possible theoretically to identify the remains of every fallen fighter. If all that can be done is done, there ought to be no more unknown soldiers.

Only one thing would be better than that: No more wars.

Rebels Blame Army for Fatal Village Attack

BOGOTA, Colombia—Leftist rebels said the army, not a right-wing death squad, had carried out an attack earlier this week in which 22 villagers were killed. Army chief Gen. Mario Hugo Galan blamed the attack on a "private justice group," a euphemism for the ultra-right paramilitary gangs that routinely target guerrillas and their suspected sympathizers.

Los Angeles Times

April 30, 1998

The U.S. Shouldn't Be An Arms Broker

By Robert Kuttner

Aside effect of the end of the Cold War has been a perverse escalation in arms sales to the Third World. U.S. arms makers are by far the leading weapons merchants, accounting for nearly half of all such sales.

Oscar Arias, the former president of Costa Rica who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1987 for brokering peace in Central America, is currently in the United States, giving lectures and trying to shift U.S. policy. But with American arms makers seeking new customers and U.S. officials using arms sales as diplomatic leverage, this will not be easy.

After receiving the Nobel, Arias donated his prize winnings to endow a foundation dedicated to ending the Third World arms race. It is fitting that a Costa Rican president should lead this crusade. Costa Rica, for half a century, has been a country with no military. Arias' predecessor, Jose Figueres, abolished the armed forces in 1948, leaving only a civilian constabulary. Costa Rica, not coincidentally, has also been the region's most stable democracy.

Arias observes that if just 10% of world military spending, now approaching \$1 trillion a year, were devoted instead to human development, preventable disease and hunger would be wiped out and basic education and sanitation would be universal. Oscar Arias is one of perhaps three living global leaders who represent a kind of moral witness that the world seldom sees in national statesmen—the others being Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic and Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

In bringing peace to Central America, Arias had to win over

a skeptical Reagan administration, which was reluctant to cede diplomatic power to a mere leader of the region and suspicious that Arias might be too soft on leftists. But Arias' differences with U.S. foreign arms policy today are, if anything, even more serious.

"In the past four years," he observed in a recent lecture at Harvard, "85% of U.S. arms sales have gone to undemocratic governments in the developing world. During President Clinton's first term, his administration gave \$35.9 billion to the militaries of non-democratic governments for arms and training."

According to Arias, half of the world's governments devote more resources to arms spending than to health. They do not have the sophistication to manufacture advanced military products, such as fighters, missiles and bombers, so American arms makers are happy to provide them for a price. Even in sub-Saharan Africa, the world's poorest region, arms spending totals \$8 billion a year.

Last year, Arias convened a meeting with seven other Nobel Peace laureates, joined by Amnesty International, the American Friends Service Committee and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, to create an International Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers. The code is now endorsed by 16 Peace Prize honorees, including Elie Wiesel, the Dalai Lama, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and this year's winner, Jody Williams.

The code would commit advanced countries not to sell arms to nations that failed to recognize basic human rights or that engaged in armed aggression or terrorism. All countries would have to report their weapons sales and pur-

chases to the U.N.

The U.S. is cool to the Arias initiative. In fact, last August the Clinton administration lifted a ban on the sale of high-tech weapons to Latin America. Tenuous Latin democracies long plagued by hyperactive generals can buy sophisticated and astronomically expensive weapons, like the F-16, consuming resources desperately needed for education and health. On the eve of Clinton's recent trip to a Summit of the Americas in Santiago, Chile, Arias and former President Jimmy Carter proposed a two-year moratorium on weapons sales to the region. They were

rebuffed by Clinton.

The administration, lobbied hard by arms manufacturers, argues that if we don't sell these weapons, somebody else will. Arias retorts that this logic is not unlike Colombia contending that if they don't supply cocaine to North Americans, Bolivia will simply take over the business. The obvious solution, in both cases, is a universal moratorium.

At Santiago, Clinton spoke eloquently about the advancement of human development, democracy and free trade. But if we truly wish to promote the former, we need to restrict government-promoted trade in arms.

Robert Kuttner is co-editor of the American Prospect.

Washington Post May 1, 1998 Pg. 15

Free To Incite Genocide

By Stephen S. Rosenfeld

Our Western reflexes supporting the free flow of information and the free expression of opinion never imagined the nightmare situations in Bosnia and Rwanda, where the media, especially radio, whipped up genocide. That is how we come to be unprepared for the tough policy choices raised by proponents of jamming -- sending signals that keep a radio's own signals from getting through.

We are talking here about much more than the nasty, bordering-on-inciting broadcasting that routinely dirties the political atmosphere, as much Palestinian radio does, for instance. The special problem lies in local broadcasting that is joined to real physical persecution and widespread killings, as in Bosnia and Rwanda. The example of these two mass murderings compels people in the West to review their thinking about some of the consequences of unlimited freedom of speech, and some of the policy impli-

cations.

Jamming would prevent the governments, clans or militias doing the broadcasting from exercising rights to freedom of opinion and expression that are not only treasured in our society but internationally guaranteed. Ironically, it was American respect for those broadcasting standards that led NATO to knock out four Bosnian Serb broadcasting towers last fall. It seems that it is now illegal to jam but not to bomb a tower.

Certainly the easy, popular, Western thing to do is to embrace Article 19, the famous foundation-stone assertion of media liberty written into the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. The remedies it implicitly offers for even the most egregious violations of media responsibility are good journalistic practice, the open competition of ideas and political suasion.

But what then are you prepared to see done about the real and potential instances in which broadcasting abandons

its status as an instrument of communication and even as an instrument of propaganda and becomes literally a weapon of mass murder? This happened in Bosnia and Rwanda. It could happen in other societies vulnerable to media-spread carnage.

Jamming offers frustrated policymakers a tempting option. The post-Cold War disease of frightful internal disorders has revealed a paralyzing gap between a Gulf War-type military intervention, which virtually no one can see being repeated, and the lesser humanitarian interventions that, though they might be feasible, might not do the job. Jamming falls into that gap between high-end and low-end inter-

ventions.

A basic distinction has to be made. The radio stations in the killer countries are not independent news organizations in any sense that would be recognized in the West. These media are predominantly state-controlled propaganda outlets. They did not so much disseminate information as license the hate that fanned the evident existing strains in Yugoslav and Rwandan society into genocide.

We Western journalists are comfortably removed from such consequences of media illiberality. We are also sharp-eyed in the perception of others' media abuses. It becomes harder to stay aloof, however, when we consider that in other

societies our tenets of press freedom may have costs that are paid in grand multiples of human lives as well as in the Western coin of the embarrassment of politicians.

The stunning and constantly improving capacity of our electronics to pick up the signals of rogue radio almost anywhere poses its own challenge. No longer can we hide behind the excuse that we didn't know what was going on. Our electronic progress is going to force us to address questions that simply were not on the front burner before.

The United States alone possesses the technology for listening in on the world and the resources for worldwide

military deployments. That means we may face situations of emergency where some voices will argue that to save endangered lives we must act quickly and perhaps alone.

Even the disinterested exploration of the idea of jamming may be considered an opening to the forces of censorship and an invitation to the anxious and the unprincipled to carve out their own self-serving exceptions to press freedom. But the pressure is on to sort through the idea in a way that will separate legitimate from illegitimate usages, provide a useful weapon against the incitement of genocide and allow the principles of free speech to shine through.

Philadelphia Inquirer

May 1, 1998

Pg. 20

NATO's expansion plans uniting Russians — in opposition

Adding Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to the military alliance will increase tensions, they say.

By Inga Saffron
INQUIRER STAFF WRITER

MOSCOW — First Russia lost the Cold War, then its sprawling empire, its industrial prowess and its military might. Now, with a bitter sense of resignation, Russian policymakers are waiting for the next blow: news that the U.S. Senate has agreed to let three former Soviet satellites join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In the United States and Western Europe, proponents of NATO expansion argue that allowing Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to join the Atlantic alliance is a cheap and easy way to stabilize the new democracies of Eastern Europe. But for Russia, the triumphant expansion of its old nemesis has shattered any remaining illusions about Moscow being allowed to join the elite club of prosperous Western nations.

By admitting the former Warsaw Pact countries to NATO, Russians believe, the West is again drawing a dividing line through Europe, one that could prove as impermeable and dangerous as the old Iron Curtain.

"Maybe there won't be a crash in relations with the West right away, but in three or five years we could find ourselves back to a situation of great mistrust and mutual misunderstanding," Alexei Arbatov, a liberal Russian legislator and arms-

control expert, said Wednesday. "We are entering a period of great uncertainty in our strategic relations."

NATO officials have tried to soothe Russia's hurt feelings, saying that the inclusion of its three former satellites was merely meant to prevent internal ethnic conflicts. Moscow isn't buying that argument.

It's not just that Russia is being ostracized by the Western alliance, opponents of NATO expansion complain; Russia is also being cast as NATO's opponent, they say. "When I met with the top brass at NATO, I asked them who they considered their potential enemy," recalled Galina Starovoitova, another Western-oriented member of the Russian parliament. "They couldn't answer."

From the most Westward-looking liberals to the most virulent nationalists, there is agreement in Russia that NATO's extension into what was the Soviet Union's turf eventually will chill relations with the United States. Russian politicians will try to retaliate by resisting American foreign-policy initiatives and challenging the United States in world forums such as the United Nations, much as they did during the recent crisis over Iraq.

Already, many in the West believe Russia's recent opposition to U.S.-led military action against Iraq, its support for Serbia's crackdown on

ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, its recent threats against Latvia, its alleged meddling in the oil-rich Caspian Sea region, and a sharp increase in weapons sales to Iran are all responses to NATO expansion.

The next casualty, Arbatov predicted, is likely to be the START II arms-reduction treaty, which is scheduled for ratification by the Russian parliament in June. Liberals will find it hard to argue for cuts in nuclear weapons when NATO will soon have three to four times the destructive capacity of Russia, Arbatov explained.

"If we find out in May that we're not able to gather 50 percent in favor, then we will advocate postponing the vote," said Arbatov, who remains a strong supporter of the treaty. But if ratification of START II is put off again, he fears that the plan for deeper cuts in Russia's nuclear arsenal will "fade away." Indeed, Russia may feel obliged to build up its military forces, and the worst scenario includes a full-fledged arms race.

It has been clear for more than a year that the West was intent on expanding NATO, but the approach of the congressional vote has darkened the mood in Moscow, which acutely feels that it is losing influence with Washington.

A year ago, President Boris N. Yeltsin extracted a compromise from NATO in exchange for acquiescing to the enlargement of the alliance. Under a charter signed with much fanfare in Paris, Moscow was

promised a special, consultative relationship with NATO.

So far, however, that relationship has been almost nonexistent, and Russians feel hoodwinked. "It's a pity it has been only a declaration," said Valery Nesterushkin, a spokesman for the Russian Foreign Ministry.

"The only practical purpose it has served is to alleviate concern among American senators, making them believe that Russia had accepted NATO enlargement," Arbatov added.

Bitterness over the issue is already influencing Russian politics, Starovoitova said. Russian liberals have been put on the defensive by nationalists and Communists who fault them for placing too much faith in the West.

The liberals are "forced to make concessions to them in internal affairs, as in the adoption of the recent restrictive law on religion," Starovoitova wrote in a recent newspaper article. "Russian liberals are reminded daily of where the humiliations of the Versailles Treaty

led Weimar Germany. It is not worth creating a Weimar Russia."

The legislatures in all 16 NATO countries still must approve the three new members, but their induction is considered a sure bet once the Senate acts. After the three are absorbed, NATO may start talks on admitting Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which border directly on Russia. "If that happens," said Nesterushkin, the Foreign Ministry spokesman, "it means going back to some kind of confrontation."

Washington Post

May 1, 1998

Pg. 24

'All These People ... Can Affect My Reputation ...' 'They Can Do Nothing ... To Affect My Character'

Federal Document
Clearing House

Following are excerpts of President Clinton's news conference yesterday:

Reducing Persian Gulf Forces

The Pentagon said this week you're expected to decide whether to reduce U.S. forces in the [Persian] Gulf soon. Has Baghdad made sufficient progress on allowing weapons inspections to permit a reduction in force? And if so, will we see an ending of the sanctions against Iraq?

Well, those are two very different questions. Let me say, first of all, we are encouraged about the level of compliance so far with the U.N. [United Nations] inspections and by the evidence that has been educed on the nuclear side that more progress has been made.

And I believe we've already issued a statement that we believe that if Baghdad will continue to work with us, that, by October, we can -- the U.N. may well be able to certify that they are actually in compliance on the nuclear side, and they can go from the inspection to the monitoring phase.

Keep in mind, even under the agreements, the U.N. resolutions, no matter what is found out in any of these areas, there will still be a monitoring regime there.

Our position on lifting the sanctions is that the U.N. resolutions have to be complied with completely, and then we'd vote to lift the sanctions. So this is just a nuclear piece. But I am encouraged by that.

Now, on the question of reducing our military presence in the Gulf, I would wait for a recommendation from the Pentagon with involvement from the State Department and the NSC [National Security Council] on that. That is, it is -- we have a certain number of carrier groups and a certain number of assets to deploy at sea.

They have to be trained. They also need to be deployed in different places for different reasons. So, inevitably, unless we believe there is some reason for it to be there, at some point in the future I would anticipate some reallocation of our resources. But I have not received a recommendation on that yet by the Defense Department.

Russia's Mideast Strategy

What do you think is the strategy from the Russian state toward the Middle East at this point, and what are you expecting from the London talks next week? Is there a Russian strategy?

I believe there is. I think the -- I believe that basically what the Russians would like to do is to have an influence in a critical region of the world. And they have been, after all, co-sponsors of the peace process with the United States since a period before I became president -- goes back to the first Madrid conference in '92.

Will we always agree with every position they take? No, we won't. But the Russians have pledged to cooperate with us to minimize and hopefully

eliminate weapons transfers and component part transfers and things like that that should not go into explosive environments in the Middle East. And we are going to keep working with them to see that we achieve that goal.

Now, in terms of the London conference, I hope that after Secretary [of State Madeleine K.] Albright meets with [Israeli Prime Minister] Mr. [Binyamin] Netanyahu and [Palestinian Authority President] Mr. [Yasser] Arafat that we will have the elements of an agreement which will get the parties into final status talks.

You all pretty well know what the parameters are. There's still no agreement on how much of a redeployment should be undertaken by the Israelis from the West Bank in this next phase. But they are much closer than they were just a couple of weeks ago -- much, much closer. And there are some other issues that may be able to be worked out around that that might still enable us to make an agreement.

I think what both of them are going to have to decide is whether or not they believe that they're better off waiting or making -- or each side giving a little more to get to a final status talks.

Now, keep in mind, this is not a final peace agreement. We're arguing over the dimensions of a step which is part of the Oslo agreement designed to get the parties into final status talks, which are supposed to be over a year from now -- I think May of '99 is when they're sup-

posed to end.

So what we have to -- what the parties have got to make up their mind about is, do they want to roll the dice, because believe me, in the nature of all these agreements, the most principled compromise will leave both sides dissatisfied. By definition, that's the way -- you know, if the peace agreements were easy, they'd all be done already.

So the most principled compromise will leave both sides dissatisfied. What they have to decide is, do they want to roll the dice? Do they really want to gamble on six more months of basically everything in suspended animation? Do they really believe it'll be better then? Do they really believe it will be better in another year? What happens when the timetable runs out on the Oslo accord? Will we be closer to peace?

I think the answer is manifestly no. And so I'm hoping and praying that we'll be able to get something positive out of the London accords.

Prosperity and NATO

What's your message, sir, to those nations, particularly to Hungarians, millions of them living below the poverty line? I mean the Hungarian poverty line. Will they be better off by joining a military alliance? Some critics here say that this is like putting the cart before the horse, military comes first, economic integration just second. What's your take on that?

Well, first, I think it's a very legitimate question. It is a legitimate question. It's a question that bothered me, for example, when some other countries not nearly as prosperous as Hungary were asking to be

considered for NATO membership.

For the United States and for other NATO members, you know, we have to trust the elected representatives of the countries involved, in this case Hungary, Poland and the Czech

Republic, to make the right decision on that.

My view is, if it can be afforded for Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic -- if it can be afforded consistent with a commitment to economic growth and benefits preserving the social contract for the peo-

ple, it will be good economically over the long run for Hungary. Because it will tie Hungary more closely to the emerging global economy of democracies. It will identify Hungary even more clearly as a responsible nation capable of

helping NATO solve other peacekeeping problems, and it will remove any lingering questions, however rational or not, about Hungary's security. So I think it'll be good for the economy over the long run if it could be managed now.

Defense Daily

May 1, 1998

Pg. 6

Pentagon Seeks Advanced Technology To Fight Terrorism

By Frank Wolfe

In Bosnia, American forces are protected by Hesco-Bastian walls which can withstand 20,000-pound bombs without fragmenting.

By June, the Pentagon is to lay out the capabilities of three advanced alarm systems which field commanders may want for their installations.

These are just two examples of how the Pentagon is increasingly eyeing force protection technologies in the wake of the June 1996 bombing at Khobar Towers, Saudi Arabia, when a terrorist truck bomb exploded, killing 19 airmen.

In October that year, the Pentagon reorganized its force protection program, creating the J-34 Combating Terrorism office within the operations of the Joint Staff. Defense Secretary William Cohen made the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the focal point for all matters related to terrorism.

After surveying the force protection standards of other organizations, including the State Department and the British government, the J-34 developed its own standards, which Cohen approved last summer.

"As we developed the DoD standards we realized they had to be performance-based, not prescriptive because when you started looking at what the threat in South America was versus Central Command (CENTCOM) and in Europe, they were all different," Army Col. Daniel Hahn, the assistant deputy director, told *Defense Daily* in a recent interview.

As a result, the J-34 laid out the broad "performance-based" guidelines, rather than attempting to dictate to commanders-in-chief [CINCs] and the services specific "prescriptive" standards. For example, the J-34 directed the CINCs and services to consider appropriate force protection measures for military buildings based on the threat.

But to tailor protection to the threats in each theater, the CINCs and services are developing their own standards.

Centcom, European Command (EUCOM) and the Army have already approved their final force protection standards after the J-34 reviewed them. The other commands and services are staffing their force protection offices and are expected to have their final force protection standards in place by July.

"Everybody is making pretty good progress right now," Hahn said.

Seven-person teams from the Defense Special Weapons Agency are visiting U.S. installations at home and abroad to assess their force protection plans. The teams are accompanied by a J-34 representative, and, when abroad, by a Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) representative also.

The plan of the teams is to visit 100 installations per year. Under the J-34 standards, each installation must be inspected once every three years. "We've got to improve the force protection plans at the installations and their execution," Hahn said.

To assist installations in evaluating and improving their force protection plans, the J-34 is mailing them a "model template," a check-off list of potential threats and vulnerabilities. Anser Corp. developed the template, which the J-34 will install on a CD-ROM later this year to allow sharing of force protection information among commanders.

At a Nov. 1996 industry symposium former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army Gen. John Shalikashvili, promised to "engage American industry in the fight against terrorism" and said the military needed to insure force protection technology, like sensors and blast walls, reached the installations.

J-34 published a guidebook of 550 force protection technologies used by the military so field commanders could directly order them from the companies.

At a September force protection demonstration at Quantico, Va., the military and industry set up 440 displays and 150 demonstrations. That "flea market" is planned again for May next year.

Since 1996, the Pentagon has spent about \$3.5 billion a year on physical security. About 56 percent goes to military personnel--security guard salaries and benefits--while 36 percent goes to research and technologies like bomb sniffers, military construction and sensors.

The military received a one-time \$353 million security plus-up in 1997--after the Khobar bombing--which meant that last year's physical security spending was somewhat higher. But Congress killed a Pentagon request for \$13 million in additional funds for the Physical Security Equipment Actions Group in FY '98. The latter group--under the Pentagon acquisition chief's office--buys physical security technology.

But the Pentagon will receive a plus-up for the group in the FY '99 defense bill, Hahn said.

Improving force protection involves technology and a change in procedures stemming from increased threat awareness. About 70 percent of what the assessment teams are recommending involve procedural issues, rather than technology.

On one of the first assessment visits last year, a team visiting Groton, Ct., found that a rail line ran through the Naval Submarine Base New London. Cargo on the line included hazardous chemicals. The result? The company producing the chemicals agreed to re-route its traffic.

Awareness training for personnel is key to fighting complacency, Hahn said. "I think we've made great progress. I think we've got everybody's attention," he said.

Pentagon pampers picky globe-circling lawmakers

By Jock Friedly

Before a flight he scheduled to Nicaragua aboard a military aircraft in January, 1997, Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) had a top aide fax a food request to the Pentagon.

His breakfast upon departure from Philadelphia was to consist, the senator insisted, of a fresh fruit cup (specifically strawberries, grapes, orange slices and bananas), Nabisco 100% Bran cereal and Familia/Swiss Muesli original recipe, homemade pancakes, grilled sausage and home-fried potatoes.

He went on to specify his exact lunch for that day and then the precise dinner he would have on his return flight, down to the vegetable side dish (green bean almondine) and the brand of chicken (Tyson) and ice cream (Healthy Choice Vanilla).

Aide Charles Battaglia, who noted that the trip ultimately never took place, characterized it as a routine response to a routine request by the Pentagon regarding whether the senator had any special dietary requirements. Several others who have prepared for congressional travel say it is one reason why Specter is widely considered to be the most difficult congressional traveler.

While Specter's demands may have been over the top, other members of Congress place onerous demands on Pentagon and State Department officials when they go overseas on military aircraft. Indeed, some congressional entourages have required so much time of their hosts — sometimes for such tasks as guiding congressional spouses to shopping malls and on sightseeing tours — that they have been known to bring U.S. embassies in foreign countries nearly to a standstill.

Defenders of the system say that members of Congress should have their needs catered to so as to maximize the time they spend before and during their trips on substantive policy matters. And often, it is not members of Congress who dictate travel perquisites, but military officials

who want to generate good feelings about their branch of service.

Congressional delegations — codels for short — usually begin their trips with door-to-door service from the House and Senate Office buildings to Andrews Air Force Base. Vans are provided, courtesy of the Pentagon.

To ensure smooth travel, as many as five military escorts join codels. Sometimes, members of Congress will request escorts by name based on their past travel experiences with them. In the days preceding the travel, the escorts are responsible for trip preparation, including purchasing supplies. Receipts for some of the trips reveal that no detail is too small to worry about.

On a codel that Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.) led to Asia last year, the escorts brought such things as sun block, baby wipes, eye drops, Blistex, breath mints — \$14 worth — first aid kits, tampons, aluminum foil, Dramamine, three packs of cards, mouthwash, photographic film and deodorant.

On a later trip to Asia and Australia by Spence and members of his National Security Committee, Pentagon aides also bought such things as eye shades, earplugs, cotton buds, shaving cream and skin lotion.

On mid- to large-size codels, the escorts set up a control room in the hotel where the travelers can congregate. The control room is stocked with snack foods of all sorts — from breakfast cereals to M&Ms to Goldfish crackers — as well as drinks.

The food and drink usually comes from military exchange stores and, according to Pentagon receipts, can run into the thousands of dollars for larger trips. Alcohol is usually the greatest expense. This drink supplements the alcohol consumption at bars and restaurants, cocktail parties and state dinners.

Rep. Jim Kolbe (R-Ariz.) led a delegation of 20 of his congressional colleagues and accompanying staff on a 10-day trip to Hong Kong and China in January, 1997. The group left with 52 bottles of wine, at least 13 bottles of liquor and 12 cases of beer.

To supply Rep. Sonny Callahan's (R-

Ala.) August trip to Eurasia, the Pentagon bought 24 bottles of wine, several cases of beer and more than a dozen bottles of hard liquor. A separate trip of his to the Middle East began with the purchase of at least \$600 in beer, wine and spirits.

In January of last year, Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.) flew on a 10-day trip to Asia with 19 others, including five congressional spouses. The plane had 36 bottles of wine, 21 cases of beer and 11 bottles of hard liquor. Even a three-day trip by eight members of Congress and 11 others to various commercial airline facilities around the country, began with the purchase of \$300 in alcohol at GI Liquors.

"This is money that's supposed to be spent on national security," said Tom Schatz, president of Citizens Against Government Waste. "I'm not sure what overindulging will do to preserve the country."

Of course, alcohol purchase records do not indicate the drinking habits of trip participants. Nor do members have direct control over the purchase of the liquor beforehand. Nor do records reviewed by The Hill indicate how much was actually consumed during the trip. "There's no request for it," said one House aide who frequently organizes overseas travel. "We always look to [the Pentagon] to run the trip."

But in some cases, the taxpayer-funded alcohol appears to have been insufficient to last the entire journey.

An entourage led by Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) with 10 other congressional officials visited Asia last year for 10 days. On a stop-over in Anchorage, the delegation visited Humpy's Great Alaskan Alehouse, a Stevens favorite featuring 44 microbrews on tap. The bill totaled \$394, with a majority, \$230, going toward alcohol, although taxpayers picked up only one \$4 ale for the escort.

That and other restaurant visits, which were not itemized by receipt, supplemented the more than \$1,500 in alcohol that military escorts brought with them from exchange stores, including 73 bottles of wine. Half-way through the trip, escorts bought more wine and liquor. An earlier 10-day Stevens trip to the Middle East involved the purchase of nearly \$1,400 in alcohol at the journey's outset.

A spokeswoman for Sen. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.), whose name appeared on the Humpy's Alehouse bill, hung up when phoned about it and did not return a follow-up call seeking comment. Neither did a Stevens spokesman return a phone call.

At the very least, the Pentagon's pay-

ments for alcohol illustrate how members of Congress live by a different standard than do executive branch officials. For most trips, federal employees are given per diem payments for meals, which they can spend the way they like, even on alcohol. Congressional officials also receive per diem while overseas, and have to reimburse the State Department for food and drink they consume.

In this country, however, the Pentagon pays all actual expenses of congressional officials, including their alcohol. Other federal employees are not so lucky. In all-expense-paid occasions, such as when per diem is deemed insufficient to cover costs, executive branch officials are prohibited from seeking reimbursement for their liquor.

Few hard-and-fast rules, in fact, govern congressional travel expenses covered by the Pentagon. In the absence of regulations, Pentagon officials say they tell code escorts to use their best judgment and not to submit to inappropriate congressional requests.

Given the difficulty of refusing a powerful member of Congress, some inappropriate spending does occur. One military escort recalled that during the 1980s, a member of Congress roused another escort at 2 a.m. while on an overseas trip.

The representative, now retired, said he needed \$300. The escort provided the money, even though he believed it went to pay a prostitute.

For hotel and meal expenses, members of Congress receive per diem payments overseas, but the military escorts pick up the entire tab. "The guideline is generally to try to stay within the government per diem rate," described one Pentagon official.

That doesn't always happen. While in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on a code led by Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska), the Pentagon paid nearly \$1,000 of the \$1,638 tab when 22 people had dinner at the Caribe Hilton hotel, with the remainder picked up by unknown guests. The meal amounted to \$75 per person, well above the per-diem rate of \$60 for an entire day's meals and miscellaneous expenses. The next night, 21 people ate for \$1,321, of which \$943 came from the taxpayers.

Members of Congress and their staffs usually do not have to worry about carrying their luggage. It is done for them and to ensure regal treatment in hotels, military escorts generously tip maids, porters and bellhops from taxpayer funds.

When Sen. Chuck Robb (D-Va.) visited the Middle East and Eurasia for one week in March of last year with one aide and a

military escort, the escort gave a \$50 tip for maid service when staying at the embassy in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and another \$50 tip in Ankara, Turkey. Another \$179 went for baggage tips for the three travelers.

Although one Pentagon official said the guideline escorts should follow is tipping \$1 per bag, tips of \$100 and sometimes far more at hotels is routine, even for small delegations. Whether special arrangements were made, such as luggage transportation from the airport, is never specified.

On a four-stop Latin America trip for eight people led by Rep. Cass Ballenger (R-N.C.), the escorts paid \$435 for baggage and bellhop tips, including one for \$120. Emphasizing that the Pentagon is responsible for handling such logistics, Patrick Murphy, Ballenger's administrative assistant, agreed that such high tips did not seem warranted. "It looks like people are getting a big tip for doing nothing," he said.

The record for the largest tips paid by military escorts may belong to the trip to China taken by an entourage headed by Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) in January of last year. Total baggage tips approached \$2,000, the largest being \$450.

Lockheed Missile Bid Won By A Big Margin

Unit Price Was \$115,000 Under Boeing's Offer

St. Louis Post-Dispatch
April 30, 1998

Bloomberg News

WASHINGTON -- Lockheed Martin Corp.'s winning bid over Boeing Co. to produce the U.S. Air Force's new stealthy cruise missile was about 45 percent lower than the service anticipated, a top official said Wednesday.

Had Boeing won the bid, the missiles would have been produced at a former McDonnell Douglas plant - now operated by Boeing - in St. Charles.

Overall, the competition to design and produce the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff, or JASSM, reduced costs by at least \$1 billion over what the Air Force expected, said Air Force Deputy for Acquisition Darleen Druyun.

The Air Force wanted each stealth missile to cost no more than \$400,000 apiece, priced in 1995 dollars. Lockheed Martin beat that price by 45 percent, Druyun said in an interview.

"Both contractors clearly understood the price of these

missiles had to come in at something the U.S. Air Force and Navy could afford," she said.

Lockheed Martin offered the Air Force a firm price of \$275,000 per weapon for almost half the estimated 2,400 missiles the service wants to buy.

The price of the remaining missiles will be negotiated later.

Boeing offered a price of about \$390,000 per missile, but restricted its proposal to 195 missiles - the first two production batches.

Dick Caimi, vice president of Lockheed Martin's JASSM program, said: "We worked with our customers to trade off cost for performance to keep the price low. The Air Force was very proactive in getting the nice-to-have requirements out of the design."

Lockheed Martin was declared the winner of the \$2 billion competition on April 9. It was chosen to proceed into

full-scale development of the JASSM and build at least 2,400 of them between 2002 and 2009.

The outcome of the competition disappointed the 2,000 workers at Boeing's missile operation in St. Charles.

Boeing became a major player in the missile business last year, when it bought out McDonnell Douglas Corp. of St. Louis.

The JASSM will be carried on nine types of Air Force and Navy aircraft. It is designed to fly more than 100 miles to penetrate and destroy heavily defended targets.

Analysts were surprised Lockheed won because Boeing had the greater experience at producing nuclear and conventional cruise missiles. "Lockheed Martin's performance was pretty impressive," said Howard Rubel, a defense analyst with Goldman Sachs.

The key to Lockheed's victory was in developing an efficient manufacturing process

and a low-cost airframe of composite material, Druyun said.

Lockheed Martin's design stressed the use of low cost resin transfer molding techniques derived from those used to manufacture surfboards and boats, said Terry Little, the Pentagon's program manager for JASSM.

Boeing submitted an aluminum airframe design based on existing systems. "They were comfortable with it. They knew it would work. The downside was it was expensive," Little said. "Lockheed started with a clean sheet of paper, so they had a lot more flexibility. They were able to be pretty creative."

Washington Post
May 1, 1998
Pg. 13

In The Loop

By Al Kamen

He Had the Gall to Show Up
Suppose you were the French minister of defense, and

-- a week before your arrival in Washington for high-level meetings -- The Washington Post splashes across its front page a highly embarrassing account of friendly, clandestine meetings between a French military officer and one of the world's top war criminals, Bosnian Serb Radovan Karadzic.

Not exactly a proud moment for a military that considers itself a loyal NATO partner and a world-class fighting force. Would you come anyway?

Sure. Defense Minister Alain Richard showed up on Wednesday, but only after what diplomatic officials report was a lot of last-minute hemming and hawing about whether he would get on a plane.

Would you attend all your scheduled meetings with senior officials? No, he canceled at least one in a fit of pique over Washington's leak. What would you say to nosy American reporters? No comment, of course.

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and Richard worked to accentuate the positive, including growing military cooperation in Africa and possible cooperation on a reconnaissance satellite.

And at a Wednesday dinner at the Corcoran, in a gesture maybe reflecting a tense moment in relations, Cohen gave Richard a replica of an antique handgun known as the "Peacemaker."

European Stars & Stripes
May 1, 1998 Pg. 3

Reservists Get Clout

WASHINGTON — After years of lobbying, the National Guard and the Reserves finally have elevated their standing with the country's top military leader.

On Wednesday, Pentagon officials said one general from each component has been named as full-time assistant to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, U.S. Army Gen. Henry H. Shelton.

Army National Guard Maj.

Gen. Michael W. Davidson and Air Force Reserve Maj. Gen. Robert A. McIntosh will serve two-year terms beginning in June. They will advise Shelton on Guard and Reserve matters. Davidson, a 27-year veteran, is the mobilization assistant to the director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon. McIntosh heads the Air Force Reserve in Washington, D.C., and is the commander of the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, Ga. McIntosh, a command pilot, has served 32 years in the military.

Researchers discover the way anthrax kills

Washington Times

May 1, 1998

Pg. 22

ASSOCIATED PRESS

In an important step toward finding drugs to protect against some biological weapons, researchers have discovered how anthrax toxin destroys cells and rapidly causes death.

Now that science knows the target of the anthrax toxin, researchers should be able to find a drug that will block it, said Dr. George F. Vande Woude, a National Cancer Institute (NCI) researcher and co-author of a study to be published in the journal *Science*.

"An inhibitor drug would make anthrax as a weapon as useful as a water pistol," Dr. Vande Woude said.

Experts consider anthrax weapons a major threat to both military personnel and civilians. Bio-

terrorism weapons using anthrax or other bacteria are easier to make and distribute than nuclear weapons. Anthrax bombs are a major concern of United Nations weapons inspectors working in Iraq.

The military is inoculating all of its troops against anthrax, using a vaccine that would prevent infection from the disease. However, the vaccine is not 100 percent effective and most civilians do not receive these shots.

Anthrax is a rapid and highly effective killer. When it infects, the bacteria produces a toxin, or poison, that attacks cells.

"The only treatment now for anthrax is to give massive, massive amounts of antibiotics," said Nicholas S. Duesbery of NCI. "You have to give it almost immediately after

exposure. If you give it 24 hours later, it is too late. Your patient is dead."

Scientists have known that one of three proteins in anthrax toxin, called Lethal Factor, was the major cause of cell death. But science didn't know until now how LF actually killed the cells.

Dr. Vande Woude, Dr. Duesbery and their colleagues found that LF disrupts a signaling system in cells. When this pathway is blocked, said Dr. Duesbery, a cell "is cut off from the world." Its metabolism shuts down and it can no longer divide.

The toxin also causes the massive release of an inflammation protein and destruction of immune system cells.

The result, said Dr. Duesbery, is rapid shock and death.

Washington Post May 1, 1998 Pg. 28

Mexican Officer Kills 12 Joggers With Car

MEXICO CITY—A Mexican air force officer plowed his car into a group of jogging soldiers, killing 12 and injuring seven, the Defense Ministry said. The lieutenant colonel, who military sources said was "completely drunk," crashed his car into a group of two officers and 26 soldiers jogging along a roadside in the southern state of Chiapas. The ministry said the driver, who was not identified, was arrested.

Baltimore Sun May 1, 1998 Pg. 11

Large Turkish offensive against Kurds under way

TUNCELI, Turkey — Turkish military officials said thousands of troops were engaged yesterday in one of the country's biggest offensives against Kurdish separatists

in the rugged mountains of the southeast.

Up to 40,000 Turkish troops, along with fighter planes and attack helicopters, launched the assault against the rebels at the weekend. Some 74 rebels have been reported killed in the clashes along with three soldiers.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)